REMARKS

I. STATUS OF THE DRAWINGS

The drawings are objected to under 37 C.F.R. §1.83(a). The "one frequency band agile, complementary code keying (CCK) and orthogonal frequency division multiplex (OFDM) modulation-capable radio," the "data flow structure framework" and the "medium access control (MAC) mechanism" are required to be clearly shown in the drawings or otherwise canceled from the claims. The drawings have been amended to include the aforementioned elements as required. FIG. 2 has been relabeled as FIG. 2B. New FIG. 2A has been added to show the elements recited in the claims. No new matter has been entered as the elements have been provided for in the claims and specification as filed.

As such, it is respectfully requested that the objection to the drawings be withdrawn and the replacement sheet be entered.

II. STATUS OF THE SPECIFICATION

The specification has been amended for consistency in identifying the drawings as amended, FIGURES 2A and 2B. Areas of the specification referring to FIGURE 2, have been amended to refer to FIGURE 2B. The first paragraph has been amended to update the cross-reference to corresponding U.S. patent application no. 10/334,747, filed December 31, 2002, now U.S. patent no. 6,873,611. No new matter is involved. Entry of the amendments to the specification is respectfully requested.

Atty Docket No.: RIOSTEK.CIP1 Customer No.: 24943

Application No.: 10,621,688 Amendment dated 07/17/2007 Reply to Office Action 04/17/2007

III. STATUS OF THE CLAIMS

Claims 1-5 are pending in the Application. By this amendment, Claim 5 is being

amended. No new matter is involved.

Claims 1 and 2 are rejected under the judicially created doctrine of obviousness-

type double patenting as being unpatentable over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No.

6.873.611.

Claims 3-5 are objected to as being dependent upon a rejected base claim, but

would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of the limitation of the base

claim and any intervening claims.

Claim 5 is also objected to under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent

form for failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim.

Applicant respectfully traverses the rejections and objections and requests

allowance of the claims as amended

A. REJECTION UNDER JUDICIALLY CREATED DOCTRINE OF

OBVIOUSNESS-TYPE DOUBLE PATENTING

Applicant submits an accompanying Terminal Disclaimer to obviate a double

patenting rejection over claims 1 and 2 of U.S. Patent No. 6,873,611 that is commonly owned

with this application. Accordingly, grounds for the rejection under the judicially created

doctrine of obviousness-type double patenting for Claims 1 and 2 are removed.

12

Application No.: 10,621,688 Atty Docket No.: RIOSTEK.CIP1
Amendment dated 07/17/2007 Customer No.: 24943

Reply to Office Action 04/17/2007

B. OBJECTION TO CLAIMS 3-5

Claims 3-5 would be allowable if rewritten in independent form including all of

the limitations of the base claim and any intervening claims. As mentioned above, Applicant

submits an accompanying Terminal Disclaimer to obviate a double patenting rejection of

claims 1 and 2. As such, claims 1 and 2 are believed allowable. Dependent claims 3-5 are

also believed allowable as now being dependent upon allowable claims 1 and 2. Applicant

respectfully requests withdrawal of the objection to claims 3-5.

C. REJECTION UNDER 37 CFR 1.75(c)

Claim5 was rejected under 37 CFR 1.75(c) as being of improper dependent form

for allegedly failing to further limit the subject matter of a previous claim. Claim 5 has been

amended in independent form for purposes of advancing prosecution of the present

application. Since claim 5 no longer depends from claim 2, claim 5 is believed to be

allowable. Accordingly, Applicant respectfully requests withdrawal of the rejection against

claim 5 under 37 CFR 1.75(c).

13

Application No.: 10,621,688 Atty Docket No.: RIOSTEK.CIP1
Amendment dated 07/17/2007 Customer No.: 24943

Reply to Office Action 04/17/2007

IV. CONCLUSION

The above-discussed amendments and remarks are believed to place the present

Application in condition for allowance. Should the Examiner have any questions regarding

the above amendments, the Examiner is requested to telephone Applicant's representative at

the number listed below.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: _July 17, 2007 /Juneko Jackson/

Otto O. Lee (Reg. No.: 37,871)

Juneko Jackson (Reg. No.: 48,870) Shinae Kim-Helms (Reg. No.: 57,552) Intellectual Property Law Group LLP

Attorneys for Applicant

Contact No.: 408-286-8933

Atty Docket No.: RIOSTEK.CIP1

Attachments